

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS.

Claims 1-6, 8 and 16-23 are pending in this application. Claim 1 is amended. Non-limiting exemplary support may be found at, inter alia, Figures 3, 5 and page 9 lines 8-20 of the present application.

II. TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

Applicants' representative held a telephonic interview with the Examiner on April 21, 2008, for which Applicants thank the Examiner. Agreement was reached that that the language of the amendment made herein would meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, and would overcome Billings for the reasons discussed below.

III. THE REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-6, 8, and 16-23 are rejected over 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,470,944 to Billings ("Billings") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0102894 to Hansen ("Hansen") and U.S. Patent No. 6,428,874 to McGahern et al. ("McGahern"). Claims 1-6, 8, and 16-23 are rejected on the ground of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-19 of Billings in view of McGahern and Hansen. Applicants traverse and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

A single facer corrugator belt in combination with a corrugated paper board machine, said belt comprising...a liquid polymeric resin coating applied and cured **on said outside surface of said base structure**, wherein said polymeric resin coating does not

substantially impregnate the base structure and the coating forms a **distinct layer on said outside surface of said base structure**; and a plurality of grooves formed in said polymeric resin coating....

At pages 3-4, the Office Action argues that Billings teaches a coating upon the surface of the belt, although acknowledging that “The entire structure [of Billings] is stated to have been impregnated with a liquid resin, thereby **impregnating the base 52 with the resin** as well as the outside layer of fibers with the resin.” As pointed out in the prior responses, the combination of Billings – Hansen – McGahern does not teach forming a **distinct layer on the outside surface of the belt**, as required by claim 1. Rather, the relied upon combination results in the **resin completely impregnating through the thickness of the belt**. A resin cannot simultaneously be a distinct layer on the outside surface of the belt and impregnated throughout the belt. Nonetheless, purely as a clarification, the claim has been amended to recite that the “polymeric resin coating does not substantially impregnate the base structure and the polymeric resin coating forms a distinct layer on said outside surface of said base structure.”

The Office Action notes that Billings teaches needling a fibrous web 60 into the base structure so the web’s fibers are integrated into Billing’s base structure 52, leaving an outside “surface” layer of fibers 64 which are impregnated. The Office Action then evokes a comparison by stating “applicant’s own exterior outside coating disposed on the base structure included a fibrous material which was also needled into the base structure as depicted in Figure 5 of the disclosure.” However, the mere fact that staple fibers can be needled through a base structure in no way shows that **Billings’s polymeric resin forms a distinct layer on said outside surface of said base structure**. In the present application’s example, cited by the Office Action, the polymeric resin material 82 is shown as a distinct layer on the surface of the belt, not as

impregnating it. To the contrary, Billings teaches that: “[c]omplete impregnation of the needed base structure 52 is preferred rather than a distinct layer on the outside of the base structure.” See col. 4, lines 45-48. Thus, not only does Billings teach impregnation, but it explicitly contrasts and teaches away from “a distinct layer on the outside of the base structure.”

Thus, Billings, alone or in combination with the art of record, does not disclose or render obvious the above recited claim. Billings – Hansen – McGahern does not teach forming a distinct layer on the outer surface of the belt; and indeed teaches away from such a combination.

For the reasons given above and during the interview, Billings – Hansen – McGahern does not teach forming a distinct layer on the outer surface of the belt. Applicants therefore request reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103 and double patenting rejections as independent claim 1 is patentable over Billings, Hansen and McGahern.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims are dependent from independent claim 1, discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: /Brian M. McGuire/
Ronald R. Santucci
Reg. No. 28,988
Brian M. McGuire
Reg. No. 55,445
Ph: (212) 588-0800
Fax: (212) 588-0500